thinks it would be better to put a, to mark it

Page 1790 1 81A, we could do that. JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I think what 2 3 we should do is just what Mary will do, 4 exchange this 81 for the 81 that's in the --5 it hasn't quite got into the record officially 6 yet. 7 MR. CARROLL: Right. JUDGE SIPPEL: But anyway, they'll 8 9 be an exchange of this. So we'll get rid of the old and put the new in, and try and 10 11 destroy as much of the old as we can, so 12 there's no mix-up. 13 MR. CARROLL: Okay. 14 JUDGE SIPPEL: Thank you, thank 15 you. Comcast Exhibit 81. Why don't we mark 16 it, identify it, and move it right in? 17 (Whereupon, the document referred to was marked for identification 18 19 as Comcast Exhibit 81.)

Right.

JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm sorry, forgive

MR. CARROLL:

20

21

22

me.

7 MR. OSHINSKY: This is a 2 completely changed testimony from what we 3 have. 4 MR. CARROLL: It's not completely 5 There was just a narrowing down. changed. 6 JUDGE SIPPEL: I'm glad you 7 pointed it out. I guess why don't you do that? Why don't you point out what's been 8 done with this for the record first, Mr. 10 Carroll, and then we'll move it in? 11 MR. CARROLL: Sure. There was motion practice between the two sides over the 12 13 extent of testimony to be offered on direct, 14 relating to Mr. Rigdon's employment at 15 Charter. Remarkably, the two sides were able 16 to, and happily able to reach an agreement 17 last night, that precluded the need to 18 litigate that issue all the way through. 19 Consistent with that agreement, 20 we've kept in portions of what was previously in there, related to Charter in Mr. Rigdon's 21

direct testimony, and deleted other portions

of the same, so as to avoid the issue and allow us to proceed.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Now I take it, was

it the old paragraph eight that was changed?

MR. PHILLIPS: Most of eight was

taken out, and nine and ten was taken out,

Your Honor. But the first sentence of eight

remains.

MR. CARROLL: The first sentence of eight remains.

MR. SCHMIDT: Okay, all right.

And Mr. Carroll, I think there's one other

change.

9

10

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

MR. CARROLL: Oh, we made one other change to another, that's not related to this issue. We took out one other sentence too. But we haven't added anything in.

JUDGE SIPPEL: I see, all right.

That's marked as Exhibit 81. Any objection to it being received? Then it's received as

Comcast Exhibit 81, and will be substituted for the old Exhibit 81, which will be deleted

it come to be that you had dealings with

Tennis Channel before coming to Comcast?

21

	rage 1/54
1	A In my position, running content at
2	my position at Charter, I had dealings with
3	the Tennis Channel related to carriage over a
4	long period of years.
5	Q Okay, and did you actually have
6	direct communications with people at Tennis
7	Channel? Were there people there that you
8	knew from that period of your career?
9	A Yes.
10	Q And who? Can you give some of the
11	names of people you dealt with?
12	A Sure. Patrick Wilson, Lee
13	Schlazer. At other periods, Nancy Pingitore.
14	Q Okay, and did and you had good
15	relations with the people at Tennis Channel?
16	A Yes.
17	Q Okay. Did you, in your position
18	at Charter, have occasion to make any decision
19	about carriage level for Tennis Channel on
20	Charter?
21	A I did.
22	JUDGE SIPPEL: As preliminary,

those providers, program providers that you

And was Tennis Channel one of

Channels, yes.

20

21

22

Α

dealt with while you were at Charter?

A Yes, it was.

Q And in connection with your work there, did you have occasion to consider whether to carry Tennis Channel at Charter?

MR. PHILLIPS: Your Honor, if I
may object on this for just a second. I don't
have a problem with that question coming in,
but what we agreed upon, to resolve the motion
practice, was -- and this is because we didn't
get the discovery that was internal to
Charter. We had only public information
available that we were able to get from our
own.

We didn't have the opportunity to get discovery, and that's one of the things

Mr. Carroll and I dispute on Charter. So the way we resolved this was to allow the sentence to come in, that says that Charter made the decision, based on the judgment.

I think consistent with that, going -- that to go into the details of that

	Page 1798
1	decision would completely undo the agreement.
2	MR. CARROLL: I'm not. I was
3	going to get to
4	(Simultaneous speaking.)
5	MR. PHILLIPS: That's fine.
6	JUDGE SIPPEL: You're just giving
7	me a heads up.
8	MR. PHILLIPS: I'm giving a heads
9	up.
10	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's keep going.
11	MR. CARROLL: Not needed. It's
12	understood, and the witness understands.
13	JUDGE SIPPEL: Let's keep going.
14	BY MR. CARROLL:
15	Q Okay, good. I think the only
16	question was, did you have occasion to make a
17	decision about whether to carry Tennis Channel
18	while you were at Charter?
19	A I did.
20	Q And what decision did you make?
21	A To carry it in most markets on the
22	sports tier.

A Upon evaluating the proposal, my decision is that, you know, there's no compelling business rationale for melting the Tennis Channel from the sports tier, to provide it with broader distribution. There's no compelling business rationale to do it. So I think where we're carrying it today is appropriate.

Q We have another term for the glossary maybe. Melting. Can you explain to all of us what that term "melting" means?

A Yes. So it would be moving the network out of the sports tier to a more highly penetrated tier, so that it would be in front of more subscribers than it is today.

Q Okay, and why do you use the term "melt"? Is that an industry term that's used?

A Yes, sorry. It's an industry term.

Q Okay, and why, how did the industry come up with that term? Why is melt used for that?

A You know, I don't know the exact derivation of the term, but the notion is you melt it from a higher tier, and you melt it down to a lower tier, which is where there are more subscribers. If you think of it as sort of a pyramid. Less subscribers at the top of the pyramid; more subscribers at the bottom of the pyramid.

Q Okay, and now wouldn't Comcast, based on your evaluation, wouldn't Comcast benefit from melting Tennis Channel from a sports tier to broader distribution?

A No. Actually my assessment is that there was no consumer demand to have the Tennis Channel carried on a more highly penetrated tier. So actually, by providing that broader distribution, it would really only expose Comcast to incremental expense, and might take value out of the sports tier.

Q Okay. Let's take each piece of that. How would it expose Comcast to incremental expense? What do you mean by

1	that?

A By putting the network in front of more subscribers, giving more subscribers access to the network, Comcast license fees would increase substantially. Depending on how we carried the network, according to that 2009 proposal, it would be up to million of incremental expense.

MR. PHILLIPS: Excuse me, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: Good point. You can't use numbers in an open --

THE WITNESS: Sorry.

JUDGE SIPPEL: We're in an open proceeding right now. Thank you. I think just to characterize what the expenses are.

THE WITNESS: Sure. More subscribers means more fees, which means more expense.

## BY MR. CARROLL:

Q Well, aren't there benefits -- wouldn't there be benefits to you that might

offset the expense associated with more subscribers?

A Well, based on my experience at

Charter and based on my evaluation of the

situation at Comcast, I don't think so. The

typical benefits that you would look for would

be the ability to attract incrementals, more

subscribers, or to retain more subscribers.

Q You say "attract more subscribers." Do you mean new subscribers that are not subscribers to you now?

A Correct, new subscribers to Comcast.

Q Okay, and why wouldn't that happen?

A I saw no evidence that that would happen. Typically, you find that out from the field, from customers calling in requesting the channel, or requesting that it be carried on a more highly penetrated tier. I saw no evidence of that, which was consistent with my experience at Charter.

	rage 1807
1	Q Under the sports tier arrangement
2	you already had, could subscribers if they
3	wanted strike subscribers. Could people in
4	the country, if they wanted to see Tennis
5	Channel on Comcast, could they do that
6	already?
7	A Sure.
8	Q How would that happen?
9	A They would just subscribe to the
10	sports tier, and they would have access to the
11	Tennis Channel.
12	Q And how much would subscribing to
13	the sports tier, the current arrangement,
14	cost? I think that's public information.
15	That would be public information.
16	A You can certainly find it out,
17	yes.
18	Q Okay. So you can answer that with
19	a number. Roughly how much would it cost a
20	customer, if they wanted to subscribe to the

You know, there are probably a

sports tier right now?

Α

21

variety of offers out in the marketplace. But you know, probably in the range of \$5 a month.

Q Okay, and have you looked at -well, let me get to that side in a second. I
think another piece that you said was
retaining subscribers. In addition to the
question of whether you would gain any
subscribers, I think another part of your
answer was retaining subscribers. What do you
mean by that?

A So the question is by providing that programming to consumers, does that provide them with such satisfaction that it prevents them from leaving Comcast to go to one of our competitors.

Q Now have you -- has that been an issue for you since you've been at Comcast?

Namely, have you seen any evidence that you're losing subscribers because you don't have Tennis Channel?

A No. I mean, first of all, Comcast does have Tennis Channel on the sports tier,

Page 1809 1 and there's no evidence that subscribers are 2 leaving Comcast because it's not carried on a 3 more highly penetrated tier. 4 0 Now for -- you answered this 5 question for Charter. Let me ask you for 6 Comcast. Who are Comcast's biggest 7 competitors for subscribers these days? 8 It's the same competitors. 9 Direct, AT&T and Verizon. 10 0 Okay. Do those competitors at 11 Comcast, do they carry, do they offer Tennis 12 Channel these days? 13 Α They do. 14 Have you worried about the 15 possibility that you might lose some of your 16 subscribers to your competition, because they 17 go to your competition in order to get Tennis 18 Channel? 19 No, I haven't worried about that 20 at Comcast, and I didn't worry about it at 21 Charter. 22

Well, let's limit it to Comcast.

Page 1810 1 With respect to Comcast, why is that not a 2 concern for you? There's simply no evidence of 3 that. There's no evidence from the field. We 4 5 talk to our customers every day. We get 6 information about why our customers leave us, 7 and this has not been flagged as one of the 8 issues that is driving customers to leave us. 9 And at your competition, say 10 DirecTV and Dish, do people get Tennis 11 Channel, in whatever form they get a 12 distribution, is there a price associated of 13 some sort? Yes, there is. 14 15 So they don't get it for free, in 16 other words, on DirecTV and Dish, the 17 competition? 18 Α No. 19 JUDGE SIPPEL: Can I ask one 20 question here?

Neal R. Gross & Co., Inc. 202-234-4433

MR. CARROLL: Please, Your Honor.

JUDGE SIPPEL: If a customer pays

21

Page 1811 1 the \$5, in addition to what he's already 2 paying, does he get -- if he does get the 3 Tennis Channel, does he also get the other 4 programming that's up on that sports tier, or 5 is it just the one feature, just the Tennis 6 Channel feature? 7 THE WITNESS: No. The subscriber 8 would get other programming as well. You 9 know, depending on the market, you know, 10 anywhere from 10 to 15 additional networks. 11 JUDGE SIPPEL: Well, I take it 12 then, you sign onto whatever that third tier 13 channel, third tier is offering; is that 14 correct? 15 THE WITNESS: That's correct. 16 It's a bundle of networks. 17 JUDGE SIPPEL: Bundle? 18 THE WITNESS: Yes, that's correct. 19 MR. CARROLL: Can you give His 20 Honor a sense of the other types of networks 21 that would be part of that bundle, the sports

22

tier?

1 | Could you explain what ad avails are?

A As part of an affiliation agreement, as part of getting --

Q First of all, what's -- let me interrupt. What's that short for? That short for that term "ad avails." What does it stand for?

A Advertising availability.

Q Advertising availability, and could you explain to all of us and to His Honor, what is an ad avail?

A So when we negotiate with networks for the rights to distribute their networks, part of that negotiation is to get advertising availability.

So typically in an hour of programming, there will be around 16 minutes of advertising units, of which the cable operator typically gets access to two. Then the cable operator has its own ad sales force, which sells those units, primarily to local advertisers.

1 JUDGE SIPPEL: Can you run that by 2 me one more time? I know what you mean by the ads availability. But walk me through how 3 that negotiation works. 4 5 THE WITNESS: So when you're 6 watching TV, in an hour of television--7 JUDGE SIPPEL: Yes. 8 THE WITNESS: You'll see roughly 9 16 minutes of advertisements, of which two are 10 actually sold by the local cable operators. 11 JUDGE SIPPEL: Two minutes? 12 THE WITNESS: Two minutes, as 13 opposed to by the network's advertising sales force. So Tennis Channel has its own sales 14 15 force, and Comcast Cable has its own sales 16 force, and they split the advertising 17 inventory. 18 JUDGE SIPPEL: But it's on that

basis, two minutes to 14 minutes? THE WITNESS: That's a fairly standard, yes.

22 JUDGE SIPPEL: Interesting.

19

20